

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 10-35 remain pending in the case.

Rejection under 102(b)

Claims 10-14, 16-17, 19-35

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 10-14, 16-17, 19-35 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Stone (5,282,114). Applicants have reviewed Stone and respectfully state that Stone does not anticipate the present invention for the following rationale.

With respect to Independent Claim 10 (Claims 21 and 29 include similar features), Applicants respectfully state that Claim 10 includes the feature “a support member operative to resist flexure; an electronics assembly comprising a frequency reference; a plurality of wire rope isolators coupling said support member to an enclosure; and wherein said support member is rigidly coupled to that portion of said electronics assembly comprising said frequency reference.” Support for the Claimed feature can be found throughout the Figures and Specification including Figures 1 and 4 and page 10 line 24- page 11 line 10.

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). (MPEP 2143.03).

On page 2 of the Office Action, the claimed feature of a frequency reference is contrasted with the electromagnetic /radio frequency interference filter of Stone. However, this comparison is incorrect. That is, Applicants respectfully disagree that the frequency reference as claimed is the same as an EMI/RF filter. Specifically, the term frequency reference is clearly defined in the Specification including page 10 line 24- page 11 line 10. Thus, as is clearly observable, readily shown, described and clearly claimed, the frequency reference is not an EMI/RF filter.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully state that the Claimed features “a support member operative to resist flexure; an electronics assembly comprising a frequency reference; a plurality of wire rope isolators coupling said support member to an enclosure; and wherein said support member is rigidly coupled to that portion of said electronics assembly comprising said frequency reference” as Claimed in Claim 10 (and similarly in Claims 21 and 29) are not anticipated by Stone (emphasis added).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 10, 21 and 29 are not anticipated by Stone and are therefore allowable. Thus, Applicants submit that the rejection under 102(b) is overcome. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Claims 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22-28 and 30-35 are dependent on independent Claims 10, 21 and 29 and that Claims 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22-28 and 30-35 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Claims 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22-28 and 30-35 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.

Rejection under 103(a)

Claims 15 and 18

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 15 and 18 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone in view of Lacy et al. (20050190056). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Stone in view of Lacy et al. for the following rationale.

Regarding Claim 10, Applicants respectfully state that Stone fails to teach, anticipate or render obvious the claimed features “a support member operative to resist flexure; an electronics assembly comprising a frequency reference; a plurality of wire rope isolators coupling said support member to an enclosure; and wherein said support member is rigidly coupled to that portion of said electronics assembly comprising said frequency reference” (emphasis added). Applicants further submit that Lacy et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Stone.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 10 is not taught or rendered obvious over Stone in view of Lacy et al.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully state that Claims 15 and 18 are dependent from an allowable Independent Claim 10. Therefore, Claims 15 and 18, are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base Claim and reciting further features of the present claimed invention.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 10-35 overcome the rejections of record, and therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: _____

10/3/06



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

WESTRIDGE BUSINESS PARK
123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE
WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95076
(408) 938-9060